

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Aldous	Bud & Roz	1846 W 1915 S	Syracuse	UT		2							
Allgood	Neca	1996 Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes, but D is also acceptable.	There must be a light at the intersection with Marilyn Drive/1475 W and Antelope, otherwise there will be traffic hazards with people exiting & entering the housing developments and especially serious hazzards to children crossing Antelope to attend Cook Elementary and Syracuse Jr. High.		A future traffic signal is anticipated at Marilyn Drive when the intersection meets UDOT Signal Warrants. UDOT will continue coordination with Syracuse City regarding the location of the signal. A school crossing will be maintained at Allison Way until the signalized intersection is constructed and would then be located at the signal (Marilyn Drive).
Asay	Martin	1412 N 1675 E	Layton	UT		1							
Barber	Blair & Shirley	2363 S. 2000 W.	Syracuse	UT		2							
Barneck	Ralph & Norma	1865 S 2350 W	Syracuse	UT		2							
Bartholomew	Brad	169 Country Club	Stansbury Park	UT					1			What are your comments regarding environmental impacts of this project?: Doesn't make much sense to me but then again I'm not an engineer. It seems as though you continue to build more and more roads and widening old roads and yet the traffic continues to build up. When are you going to hire urban planners? When are you going to think outside of the engineering box? Bigger, Faster, Wider, More roads are not the answer never has been and never will be. I would like to thank you for making the roads less safe.	This project is being constructed to meet existing and projected traffic demand. The WFRC, UDOT, and Syracuse City urban planners project this area of Davis County to continue to develop to accommodate the increased population growth along the Wasatch Front.
Batchelor	David	1861 Heritage Lane	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Very much so.	Complete it as soon as possible, as the congestion of traffic on Antelope Drive between 1000 W & 2000 W needs to be reduced. Alternative C is so much better than Alternative H as a driver may need the 10 feet for each shoulder for emergency parking, etc.		No response required.
Batchelor	Sharon	1861 Heritage Lane	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes			No response required.
Bennett	Samual John	1679 Marilyn Dr.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Blaisdell	J.	1014 N. Street	Ogden	UT		1							
Boyer		2532 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	2532 W. 1700 S.	1							
Briggs	Dean D., Robyn, & David	1760 S. 1000 W.	Syracuse	UT	1013 W. 1700 S.	1			1			What are your comments regarding environmental impacts of this project?: As with all the discussion on the project, the property on the southern shift is the master-planned commercial zone for the city of Syracuse. The depth of the zone availabe needs to be preserved for the future benefit of the city. Width of the needs to minimize the taking to maximize the use of the master-planned property. Taking all of the development to the south will change the type of the potential development which will have a direct impact on the revenues that can be generated thereon. It is requested to keep utility easements for the north side of the road into the north side of the present alignment. At the east end of the road improvement, a minimal improvement width is requested to be able to preserve the commercial development planned for the area. This data has been submitted.	Section 4(f) properties in the area adjacent to your property include four historic structures on the north side and none on the south side of 1700 South. Thus, alternative selection in the area of your property is constrained by Section 4(f) regulations, and these structures may not be impacted unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the Section 4(f) properties. If there is a feasible and prudent alternative that avoids the use of a Section 4(f) resource, among alternatives that use a Section 4(f) resource, the alternative that must be selected is the one that avoids the Section 4(f) resource. Alternative C, which widens to the south through this area, avoids the Section 4(f) properties and is considered to be a reasonable and prudent alternative. Widening 1700 South to the north would not be prudent and would not include all possible measures to avoid Section 4(f) resources. Widening to the south remains the preferred alternative and is the least impacting, most practicable alternative that avoids and minimizes impacts to Section 4(f) properties. It is our understanding that the city supports continued commercial development for properties along portions of 1700 South, including your property. We are actively working toward completion of the Final EIS and encourage property owners and developers to continue working closely with the city to find innovative, viable development solutions that are compatible with the proposed 1700 South improvements and that will provide long term benefits to the community.
Brionez	Shah	1313 S 1650 W	Syracuse	UT		1							
Burton	Clyde	1134 W 1700 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Call	Kerry & Janet	1745 S. Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1							
Campbell	Tena	2448 W 1300 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Clark	Jon	3307 S Bluff Dr.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Cole	Micky	2401	Syracuse	UT			1			Yes - lets just get it finished.	It would be great to get started in the near future from 2000 W. to Bluff Road. To widen this part of 1700 So (Syracuse Rd) should be a <u>priority</u> . Thanks.		According to the Wasatch Front Regional Council's Long Range Plan, additional improvements to Syracuse Road between 2000 West and Bluff Street would occur between 2013 and 2022.

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Criddle	Norine J. and Lacey A.	1557 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT		1			1			<p>What are your comments regarding environmental impacts of this project?: There is a family or two of pheasants that live in the open area to the west of my home.</p> <p>What are your comments regarding the alternatives discussed in the environmental document?: The best plan for the development of the city and the state\'s interest in tourism and Antelope Island, Alternate C looks like it is the best plan. This road is used by alot of bikers going to the island and a bike route would be of benefit to them.</p> <p>Additional input: While it will be the best for the city...it is not good for me, having to relocate at my age from a home my husband built and we have lived in for so many years. I have some berry and flower plants I would like to relocate to wherever I go, so I am hoping I will not have to move in the winter. I am concerned about finding something I can afford that will meet my needs.</p>	<p>The project would have little direct impact on the open areas that currently exist. However, as expected future development takes place, the habitat for wildlife would diminish.</p> <p>A 5-foot striped and signed bicycle lane is included in all alternatives and would be constructed as part of Alternative C.</p> <p>Your home is shown as a potential relocation with Alternative C. Right-of-way acquisition, design, and construction cannot begin until a Record of Decision is signed for the Environmental Impact Statement which is expected this summer. Right-of-way acquisition is anticipated to begin early in 2007 and construction is anticipated to begin summer of 2007.</p>
Dahl	Lloyd (E) & Alice S.	1848 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1792 W. 1700 S.	1	1			Yes	I have to buy a lot in Kaysville. I have to make a payment on the lot within 30 days. I'm not sure how soon they will build the houses. What can I do?		Your home would be a potential relocation with implementation of Alternative C. Right-of-way acquisition, design, and construction cannot begin until a Record of Decision is signed for the Environmental Impact Statement which is expected this summer. Right-of-way acquisition is anticipated to begin early in 2007 and construction is anticipated to begin summer of 2007.
Darling	Peter & Jean	1389 W. 1625 S.	Syracuse	UT		2	1			Yes.	Want traffic light at Marilyn Drive.		A future traffic signal is anticipated at Marilyn Drive when the intersection meets UDOT Signal Warrants. UDOT will continue coordination with Syracuse City regarding the location of the signal. A school crossing will be maintained at Allison Way until the signalized intersection is constructed and would then be located at the signal (Marilyn Drive).
Denhalter	Scot	1729 S. Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes.	I am concerned about the value of my property falling prior to appraisal due to the impact of Syracuse Road being widened. How can I be assured that the appraiser will assess fair market value regardless of the impending construction.		The appraisal will be done by a independent firm and will take into account existing conditions not including any planned roadway improvements.
Dodge	Jason	1408 W. 2175 S.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Doney	Devon L.	2479 W. 1500 S.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Eames	Robert D.	1737 W. 2700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1026 W. 1700 S.	1							
Eames	Ryan	4358 W 1550 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Edwards	Debbie	1402 S 1000 W	Syracuse	UT		1							
Ewing	Max & Lucy	1805 W. 1825 S.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Failoni	Joseph	3324 S. 1000 W.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Figgins	Brent	2406 W. 1300 S.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			No	The homes left on the north side of the road are already becoming run down. This will be the main entrance to our city and it will be like driving through a slum. The north side homes need to be eliminated and the area beautified to make the entrance to the city pleasing to the eye and not an eye sore.		<p>There are differences of opinion of the value of the homes that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; however, the State Historic Preservation Office has agreed to the determination of eligibility for inclusion to the NRHP. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 protects these properties and is specific in the law. Alternative C has been recommended because it is the least impacting most beneficial alternative that meets the purpose and need of the project and has fewer relocations, fewer impacts to historic properties, and fewer impacts to social conditions. Syracuse City has been involved in the alternatives selection process and has agreed with the selection of Alternative C as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative C is also compatible with the Syracuse City General Plan which calls for the north side of Syracuse Road between Allison Way and 1000 West to remain residential while the south side would convert to commercial development. In addition, transportation funds are not designated for urban-renewal type of actions</p>

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Finlinson	Judith J. and David S.	1533 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			No. I do not see why it is in the Best interest to uproot 25 families and three businesses when there is an alternative route through the fields. I guess residents are not important to Syracuse or the State.	A more traffic friendly road is needed through Syracuse as traffic is really high. I do not feel good about the decision that has been made. Why was the choice of going back through the fields taken out of the options - that land is vacant and will not impact nearly as many people. I am sorry people and their needs are not important.		Alternatives E and F were looked at extensively as they minimize impacts to Section 4(f) properties (historic properties and parks). Alternative E was removed from further study because it is not consistent with the Syracuse City General Plan and would segment property planned for major commercial development. Segmenting this property would change the type of commercial development and affect Syracuse City's tax base. Alternative F was eliminated for the same reasons as Alternative E and because it would impact Founders Park.
Gooch	Mike	1461 S. 4500 W.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Gooch	Timothy C.	1797 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Good	Penny	1461 S 4500 W	Syracuse	UT		1							
Goodfellow	Barbara	1855 S 1865 W	Syracuse	UT		1							
Grisim	Charles	3816 W. Form By Circle	Syracuse	UT		1							
Hamblin	George C. & Marian A.	2031 S. 1000 W.	Syracuse	UT	2071 W. 1700 S.	2	1			This Alternative C Route is not only the best route but the only one so stay with it. Lets get it done.	Thanks for having us at your display at Syracuse City Office. We own property at the 2000 West 1700 So. Intersection. We also was involved in Syracuse City's downtown plan. We need the intersection to be most efficient and walkable as possible. It really should be the place to meet in Syracuse. Lets quite talking and worrying about what a few citizens think. Now is the time for action and follow through. Thank you. George C. Hamblin. 825-0273		As part of Alternative C the 2000 West intersection would be improved by the addition of exclusive right-turn lanes on all four approaches of the intersection; single left-turn lanes on the south, east, and west approaches; and dual left-turn lanes on the north approach. This would improve the operation and safety of the intersection. In addition, sidewalks would be constructed along the roadway within the project limits improving the walkability of the area.
Hamblin	Stan	3454 W 2700 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Hardman	Heather	1483 S Prestwick Dr.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Holt	Deron	1517 S. Marilyn Drive	Syracuse	UT		1							
Holt	Kathryn W.	1283 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1261 W. 1700 S.	1	1			It always has been the best conclusion for the city. It is only not a good conclusion for me because it removes my house.	We have hacked this thing over for so long we're tired of it. Just get on with it so we can get on with our lives.		Your home is shown as a potential relocation with implementation of Alternative C. Alternative C has been recommended because it is the least impacting, most beneficial alternative that meets the purpose and need of the project and has fewer relocations and Section 4(f) (historic) impacts than Alternative D and would impact fewer families.
Holt	Kathleen	1327 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1283 W. 1700 S.	1	1			I agree - it only makes sense. It also preserves the commercial corridor into the city.	Its about time! Lets get it going!		No response required.
	Scott W.					1	1			Whole heartily - it is the <u>only</u> and <u>best</u> alternative & should have been selected last year.	My house will go & I would appreciate being one of the first to be appraised - so I have time to build - Thank you. Please complete the project as soon as possible. This road should have been built 10 years ago based upon [want?]. Please put us first on the list to acquire the land from me.		No response required.
Hogan	Wade	2872 S. 2000 W.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Hoppe	Brent & Carole	2042 W. 700 S.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Hughes	Wayne L. Sr. & Patricia L. Hampton-Hughes	1782 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1506 W. 1700 S.	2			2			What are your comments regarding environmental impacts of this project?: We own a home that was built in 1910 by Thomas J. Thurgood, one of the first families to move to Syracuse and settle the land here. The home also has famous William Allen arches on it, such as many of the homes on Gentile and Angel Streets in Layton have on them. William Allen was a famous architect in 1910. Mr. T.J. Thurgood was Syracuse City's first mayor and held town board meetings in the parlor of our home. He was also legendary for bringing irrigation and culinary water to Syracuse. T. J. maintained the original Syracuse cemetery for no pay except for the black iron fence that still stands in our yard today. I think it would be a shame to not save this wonderful landmark in Syracuse. What are your comments regarding the alternatives discussed in the environmental document?: My husband and myself are all for \"Alternative C\" which would take out the south side because there are less homes and more open land on this side, thus impacting fewer homeowners. Current businesses have also set back to the proposed line in a majority of the businesses on the south side. The north side also presently has curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the north side of the road in some spots, yet the south side has little or none of these things. We have a home based business that would only be positively affected if our home on the north side would be allowed to stay. We will again continue to finish and enhance our home with a fence and the driveway being redone if we are allowed to keep our home on the north side of the Syracuse Road.	Alternative C would not require any property acquisition or the relocation of this historic structure (1782 West 1700 South). No response required.

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
												Additional input: Thank you for taking the time to listen to our comments and we hope to hear from you in the future with some good news for the homeowners on the north side. We am also sorry for most of the homeowners on the south side of the street. One home in particular we don't want to see go is the old Jetta Walker home but it has major changes made to the outside of the home. Most of the other old homes on the south side have been changed too much to be considered older than 50 years without major changes...ours has maintained it's dignity and personality and looks almost the same as it did when it was built.	No response required.
Hunt	G. Wayne & Denise	1890 Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		2							
Ihrig	Kevin	2276 W 1825 S	Syracuse	UT		1	1			I don't have a strong preference for any alternative.	Please bury all utilities possible. Please include bike lanes.		Burial of utilities would require cost participation by Syracuse City. Syracuse City has decided that all overhead utilities will remain overhead at this time. A 5-foot striped and signed bicycle lane is included in all alternatives and would be constructed as part of Alternative C.
Ihrig	Mark	2276 W 1825 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Johnson	Tom	1799 S. Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1							
Johnson	Ramona	1799 S. Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1		1				I support the decision to go with Alternative C. I support the decision to eliminate Alternatives E and F. I'm against raised islands or curbing of any kind in the center of the street. I support the way they've designed Alternative C on the display boards. I'd be in favor of them doing exactly the way it shows for Alternative C. If they do need to choose a different alternative, I would be in favor of anything that stays on the corridor.	Although raised medians are not anticipated at this time for the Syracuse Road corridor, some raised median will be required at signalized intersections (1000 West and 2000 West) to protect left-turn movements. While it is sometimes inconvenient for those who would have only right-in right-out access to Syracuse Road, turning restrictions are often necessary to provide safety for both those using as well as those accessing Syracuse Road. Also, in the future UDOT may reevaluate the need for raised medians along the entire corridor to protect safety and operational conditions along the roadway.
Jones	Dave & Colleen	1768 W 1825 S	Syracuse	UT		2							
Jones	Phyllis & Jerry K.	1558 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1708 W. 1700 S.	2	1			Yes	Syracuse needs this section completed soon as possible. We were involved in a rear end colision last May. My wife still has problems with her neck & back because of it.		No response required.
Knight	Lurlen	400 S. 2000 W.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Loertscher	Bard	1638 S 1100 W	Syracuse	UT		1							
Loose	Elizabeth B. & Martin L.	1452 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1384 W. 1700 S.	1	1	1		I live on NW corner of Antelope/Maryland intersection. When eastbound traffic on Antelope is stopping in center left turn lane waiting to go E and has the lane filled up past my driveway, how do I get out of my drive to get to the east bound inside lane on Antelope?	I live on NW corner of Antelope/Maryland intersection. When eastbound traffic on Antelope is stopping in center left turn lane waiting to go E and has the lane filled up past my driveway, how do I get out of my drive to get to the east bound inside lane on Antelope?	Living at 1452 West these days and trying to go east from my home is an impossibility because of a yellow barrier right in front of my home. I don't know who put the barrier in, but it's a nuisance for five or six of us who live on the north side of Antelope. Leaving my home two or three times a day and putting an extra 2 miles on my car each time I leave at \$2 a gallon per gas or more is costing too much money based on the idea of what the barrier is really for. It's my understanding that the barrier was placed there to stop westbound Antelope traffic from turning south on Allison Way. And every time I think of this, I go mad crazy because if that was the sole reason for putting up that barrier in front of us, our homes, I think it was a crazy decision because all it would take would have been to put a barrier on the north end of Allison where it joins Antelope and reroute traffic heading north on Allison so that it could not enter Antelope at that intersection. Doing this would have saved the barrier. You would not have needed it. Five of us would not have had to turn west in order to have put the extra mileage on our cars at \$2 per gallon, etcetera. I'd like you to consider this and get rid of that barrier in front of my home immediately, if not sooner. Yours truly.	Although raised medians are not anticipated at this time for the Syracuse Road corridor, some raised median will be required at signalized intersections (1000 West and 2000 West) to protect left-turn movements. While it is sometimes inconvenient for those who would have only right-in right-out access to Syracuse Road, turning restrictions are often necessary to provide safety for both those using as well as those accessing Syracuse Road. Also, in the future UDOT may reevaluate the need for raised medians along the entire corridor to protect safety and operational conditions along the roadway.
Marshall	Josh	1847 S Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1							
Maxwell	Dan	2088 S Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1							
McBride	Mike	3400 W 1700 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
McBride	Paul	1586 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes	In my case it appears as though I will be able to retain my business location with the south shift. So I am pleased with the decision. Final planning will still be needed to see for sure if I will still have access. Hopefully I will. If so this project should benefit me and many others in our community.		Alternative C would maintain your business and access to your business. Although raised medians are not anticipated at this time for the Syracuse Road corridor, some raised median will be required at signalized intersections (1000 West and 2000 West) to protect left-turn movements. While it is sometimes inconvenient for those who would have only right-in right-out access to Syracuse Road, turning restrictions are often necessary to provide safety for both those using as well as those accessing Syracuse Road. Also, in the future UDOT may reevaluate the need for raised medians along the entire corridor to protect safety and operational conditions along the roadway.

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Milligan	Les A.	1757 W 1825 S	Syracuse	UT		2	1			Yes!	1. We're in need of a traffic lite at Heritage Lane, coming out onto Antelope Dr. 2. We fear a danger at 2000 W where the road will narrow. 3. We NEED a post office here in Syracuse. 4. We need a nice family sit-down restaurant in our city center, like Olive Garden, Mimi's, etc. 5. We oppose a "fast food" rest. in our city center. 6. We oppose a "used car lot" in our city center. 7. Please HURRY UP! 8. We need better lighting - more street lite		1. A traffic signal cannot be constructed at Heritage Lane because UDOT requires 2640-ft between signals (there is only 875-ft between Heritage Lane and 2000 West). A future traffic signal is anticipated either at Allison Way or at Marilyn Drive when the intersection meets UDOT Signal Warrants. UDOTwill continue coordination with Syracuse City regarding the location of the signal. 2. The final design will consider both capacity and safety as it transitions to the two-lane roadway west of 2000 West. 3-6. The Environmental Impact Statement relates to transportation related improvements necessary to address current and future traffic needs. Concerns with development should be coordinated with Syracuse City staff. 7. No response required. 8. Decorative lighting along the corridor could be implemented as part of Alternative C but would require cost participation by Syracuse City.
Miller	Brent V.	1676 S. 1100 W.	Syracuse	UT	1264 W. 1700 S.	1	1			Yes			No response required.
Mills	Cosette	1870 S. 1575 W.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Mollenhauer	Alan & Barbara	444 S. 3000 W.	Syracuse	UT		2	1			Yes.	Put in left turn signals right away. Extend the project all the way to Bluff Road. That will include the new school being built there.		Left-turn signals would be installed as part of the roadway improvements which are scheduled to begin construction in Summer 2007 pending approval of the environmental document. According to the Wasatch Front Regional Council's Long Range Plan, additional improvements to Syracuse Road between 2000 West and Bluff Street would occur between 2013 and 2022.
Moon	Beth	2329 W 1700 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Morse	Dave & Kathy	1245 W 1240 S	Syracuse	UT		2							
Moser	Kay D.	1154 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1136 W. 1700 S.	1							
Moulton	Kristen					1							
Mullin	Leigh	1282 S. 2375 W.	Syracuse	UT		1	1				Buy my house at 1264 W 1700 S. Can't sell it an can't do much with it but rent it and renters complain about the road noise.		No right-of-way would be required from this property with the implementation of Alternative C, thus it would not be necessary to purchase the property as part of the project. Existing noise levels are 66.2 dBA and predicted noise levels with Alternative C are expected to reach 69.0 dBA by year 2030. This property has an existing noise impact and is still impacted in year 2030 with Alternative C. A noise wall is not feasible for your home because openings in noise wall for driveways destroy their effectiveness.
Mullin	Steve	1282 So 2375 W.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			It is the least impacting to people having to move at the cost to the state. However these people will be moving because its commercial property anyways.	You have 15 homes zoned residential, the most lasting impact will be to these. More lanes means more traffic which creates more noise. My home at 1264 West 1700 South is a rental now. Every renter has complained about the noise as the bedrooms sit on Antelope Drive. The lot is too small to be commercial & will be locked in by everything else around it. It will be severely de-valued by the busy road & will be harder to rent at the current monthly rent. My house needs to be taken with the rest of the properties.		No right-of-way would be required from this property with the implementation of Alternative C, thus it would not be necessary to purchase the property as part of the project. Existing noise levels are 66.2 dBA and predicted noise levels with Alternative C are expected to reach 69.0 dBA by year 2030. This property has an existing noise impact and is still impacted in year 2030 with Alternative C. A noise wall is not feasible for your home because openings in noise wall for driveways destroy their effectiveness.
Nelson	Donald G.	1729 W 1700 S	Syracuse	UT	1687 W. 1700 S.	1							
Orn	Jeffrey	1312 W 2175 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Orton	Phillip	1235 S Prince's Cir.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Ostler	Garrett A	1516 S 4000 W	Syracuse	UT		1							
Page	Elaine	1788 W 1915 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Palmer	Phillip Terry	1867 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1729 W. 1700 S.		1			I do. I feel it would be most direct with least impact one xisting homes. I am in favor of C.	As we get closer to actual construction I would like to know more about traffic flow and impact on my business.		A traffic control plan will be required during construction and will require advance notice to those along the corridor. Access will be maintained to all residences and businesses during construction.
Perez	Robert E.	1358 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1412 W. 1700 S.	1	1			Yes, it is the least impacting one to us.	To see if we can get a noise wall for our house.		Although your home would have a noise impact, according to the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy, with Alternative C, a noise wall is not feasible for your home because openings in noise walls for driveways destroy their effectiveness.
Peterson	Mollie	1787 S. 2000 W.	Syracuse	UT		1							

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Peterson	Wallace	1787 S. 2000 W.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes we like 'C' best. 110' R. of W. with turn lanes and bike path is great.	The sooner you can start and finish the <u>Better</u> . Possible home sellers need to know soon so they can sell and start their new houses.		No response required.
Phelps	Daniel J	880 West Heritage Park Blvd #120	Layton	UT	?	1							
Poppe	James S. & Leann J.	1342 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1358 W. 1700 S.	2	1			Yes. Because we will get to stay in our home and we will have an easier time getting out of our driveway and it will not	We have 4 large trees that run along the south facing property line that we would not be opposed to having them removed if needed. We would just like to be informed when the final plans are made.		It is very unlikely that the trees would need to be removed as part of Alternative C. You will be notified of upcoming activities during final design.
Ramage	William	1482 West 2125 South	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes I agree that alternative C would have the least impact on the number have affected and make the need improvement to widen the road.			No response required.
Russon		1171 W 1625 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Sackett	Lavell	3384 S. 1000 W.	Syracuse	UT		1							
Schofield	Nolan & Linda	2461 S. 1660 W.	Syracuse	UT		2	1			Yes Proceed get with it!!!			No response required.
Shiba	Yoshio & Chicko	1679 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1661 W. 1700 S.	2							
Smith	Franklin	1536 W 2175 So.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			No. I would like to have a traffic light at Marilyn Dr.			Alternative C has been selected as the Preferred Alternative because it has fewer environmental and Section 4(f) (historic) impacts than Alternative D. A future traffic signal is anticipated at Marilyn Drive when the intersection meets UDOT Signal Warrants. UDOT will continue coordination with Syracuse City regarding the location of the signal. A school crossing will be maintained at Allison Way until the signalized intersection is constructed and would then be located at the signal (Marilyn Drive).
Smith	Paul & Michele	1642 W. 1175 S.	Syracuse	UT		2	1			No. I think that widening to the north is a superior alternative for the long-term benefit of the City & its residents for the following reasons: 1. Widening to the north may impact more existing residents, but that could be a <u>good</u> thing! A 45+ year old "historic" home can also be a <u>blight</u> if the owner has not maintained it. 2. Antelope is an "entry" into Syracuse. The properties & businesses on either side set the character of the city. Please remove the blight! 3. Please consider a "green strip" down the center of the road to lessen the appearance of a concrete jungle.			1. There are differences of opinion of the value of the homes that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; however, the State Historic Preservation Office has agreed to the determination of eligibility for inclusion to the NRHP. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 protects these properties and is specific in the law. Syracuse City has been involved in the Alternatives Selection process and has agreed with the selection of Alternative C (mostly south shift) as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative C is also compatible with the Syracuse City General Plan which calls for the north side of Syracuse Road between Allison Way and 1000 West to remain residential while the south side would convert to commercial development. 2. Transportation funds are not designated for urban-renewal type of actions. 3. A landscaped center median was considered, but not included in the Preferred Alternative, mainly because it would restrict left turn access to and from adjacent properties.
Smith	Val & Elva	1018 W 2920 S	Syracuse	UT		2							
Staley	Henry & Kate	498 E. Fort Lane	Layton	UT		2	1			Yes. I think it is obviously the smarter way to go because it has the least impact on residents and business owners. Alternative D impacts a lot more people.			No response required.

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Talbot	H. James	773 W. Northridge Court	Farmington	UT			1					<p>My name is Jim Talbot, and I'm the principal owner in the Desertscape Development LLC Partnership. Our development is scheduled for early spring 2006, and we're located on the SW Corner of Antelope Road and 1000 West. Our current plans are to develop the 16.5 acres for a 175,000 sq. ft. neighborhood shopping center.</p> <p>I have met twice with UDOT and Horrocks Engineering staff and have explained the hardship we are facing in developing this shopping center with the three road designs they have presented me as options for improving Antelope Road. I have spent considerable dollars in preparing and purchasing this land. The damages incurred with this development would be considerable if these options were pursued regarding the right-of-way UDOT is requesting.</p>	<p>We very much appreciate your comments relating to the Syracuse Road EIS and we would like to take this opportunity to respond to the concerns expressed in your February 15, 2006 letter and to reiterate the recommendation of the EIS and the basis of this recommendation.</p> <p>The proposed 1700 South road improvements would be constructed with federal funds and therefore the EIS and decision making process must comply with all federal laws. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that impacts and effects of the project be addressed and considered. In addition, 23 U.S.C. 138 (commonly referred to as Section 4(f)) prohibits the use of land from a significant publicly owned public park, recreation area, wildlife/waterfowl refuge, or any significant historic site unless a determination is made that (i) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the property; and (ii) the action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use. A significant historic site is defined as being eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).</p>
Talbot	H. James											<p>I'm very much aware that there is considerable land available for the right-of-way on the North side of Antelope Road. The hesitation has been that the homes in the area are considered "historical."</p> <p>Your designs will jeopardize a 68,000 sq. ft. Major Anchor who will leave the Syracuse area due to critical parking spaces taken by the proposed right-of-way. In addition, this development will lose two prime on-acre commercial pad sites. These pads have a value of one million dollars each in the development of the shopping center.</p> <p>To date, I have lost tenants who had a desire to locate in our shopping center. Due to the uncertainty of the right-of-way situation and the delay it is causing us in starting construction, they have now opted to locate elsewhere.</p>	<p>As indicated in your letter, there have been a number of meetings and ongoing coordination with you and with Mr. Briggs regarding the EIS and the potential effects to properties along 1700 South. As we have previously discussed, the EIS considered a wide range of alternatives. These alternatives were evaluated for their ability to meet the project's Purpose and Need and their potential environmental impacts, including the number of relocations and impacts to Section 4(f) resources (historic structures). Build alternatives that were evaluated included roadway widening equally about the existing centerline (Alternative A), widening to the south (Alternatives B and C), widening to the north (Alternative D), and shifting the road to the south through the Briggs property (Alternatives E and F). Of these, widening north (Alternative D) and widening south (Alternative C) were carried through the detailed EIS analysis along with the No-action alternative.</p>
Talbot	H. James											<p>I can't express enough the financial impact and devastation this is having on our development. The shopping center ground is very expensive and the loss of tenants and right-of-way will be very costly both to the development and in revenue due Syracuse City by way of property tax, sales tax, and national exposure.</p> <p>I urge UDOT to be prudent in the taking of right-of-way that affects this property. The life span of this development will far out last the improvements to Antelope Road.</p> <p>I find it troubling that UDOT would not consider taking the right-of-way from the properties on the north side of Antelope Rd. Many of these homes are already master-planned commercial and will undoubtedly be for sale and eventually demolished to make room for further commercial development.</p>	<p>As part of the NEPA evaluation, the number of residences potentially requiring relocation is one notable difference between Alternatives C and D. Between 1000 West and 1250 West, widening to the north (Alternative D) would potentially relocate ten additional families that would not require relocation for widening to the south (Alternative C). Also, the property north of 1700 South is designated residential on Syracuse's General Plan and the remainder property (lot depth) resulting from widening to the north would restrict both residential and commercial development.</p>
Talbot	H. James											<p>This development in the long run will provide millions of dollars of revenue for the city. I would hate to see this development vanish based on current right-of-way issues.</p> <p>Please keep me updated as to your progress. We are anxious to get a clear decision by UDOT so we can continue with our development plans. Time is money, especially in the development business, and a timely decision on your part is critical to us. In the mean time, we will move forward with our development plans for this property.</p>	<p>Section 4(f) properties in the area adjacent to the Briggs property include four historic structures on the north side and none on the south side of 1700 South. Thus, alternative selection in the area of the Briggs property is constrained by Section 4(f) regulations, and these structures may not be impacted unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the Section 4(f) properties. If there is a feasible and prudent alternative that avoids the use of a Section 4(f) resource, among alternatives that use a Section 4(f) resource, the alternative that must be selected is the one that avoids the Section 4(f) resource. Alternative C, which widens to the south through this area, avoids the Section 4(f) properties and is considered to be a reasonable and prudent alternative.</p>

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Talbot	H. James												Widening 1700 South to the north would not be prudent and would not include all possible measures to avoid Section 4(f) resources. Widening to the south remains the preferred alternative and is the least impacting, most practicable alternative that avoids and minimizes impacts to Section 4(f) properties. It is our understanding that the city supports continued commercial development for properties along portions of 1700 South, including the Briggs property. We are actively working toward completion of the Final EIS and encourage property owners and developers to continue working closely with the city to find innovative, viable development solutions that are compatible with the proposed 1700 South improvements and that will provide long term benefits to the community. We are readily available to continue meeting/coordinating with the city and property owners regarding the proposed improvements to 1700 South. For continued coordination, I can be reached at 801-620-1685.
Taylor	Mark	1747 S. Heritage Lane #A2	Syracuse	UT		1							
Tenney	Kevin	2632 W 1300 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Thedell	Earl	1831 Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes I agree it would be more beneficial in the future the traffic is will increased more as home's being build.			No response required.
Thurgood	Colleen	1765 W 1700 S	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes	My concern deals with the "slowness" of the development of this project. We have heard for over a year now that whatever option is decided upon, my home would be taken, yet we are still months away from property acquisition. Ourlives have been on end wondering what to do. We would like to begin construction of a new home, but since widening of the road is still in limbo, we don't know whether or not to start. My suggestion is: please get the project on a fast tract.		Your home would be a potential relocation with the implementation of Alternative C. Right-of-way acquisition, design, and construction cannot begin until a Record of Decision is signed for the Environmental Impact Statement which is expected this summer. Right-of-way acquisition is anticipated to begin early in 2007 and construction is anticipated to begin summer of 2007.
Thurgood	Drew L.	1102 W. 1700 S.	Syracuse	UT	1320 W. 1700 S.	1							
Tuft	Sylvia	1312 W 2175 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Vanderloo	Patty	1115 S 2500 W	Syracuse	UT		1							
Wallace	Brian	3391 S. 875 W.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			I believe the south side of 1700 So. Is the best side to expand the right of way.	Make the road at least 110 feet to accomidate traffic for many years to come. Build it asap!		No response required.
	Wendy					1	1			Yes.	110 Right-way is best. It will be regretted if the 90' is chosen. We need it, yesterday!!! Please do not delay it any farther.		No response required.
Weathers	Blake & Janine	903 S. Jupiter Hills Cir.	Syracuse	UT		2	1			Yes - it makes the most sense.	Very well presented.		No response required.
Weiler	Frank	1570 W. 2350 S.	Syracuse	UT					1			What are your comments regarding environmental impacts of this project?: I am 100% behind the recommended option. It is has the best tradeoff between the benefits and negative impacts. What are your comments regarding the alternatives discussed in the environmental document?: It was obvious that a lot of work went into developing alternatives. Although most of them would be a mistake, it was good to have a broad evaluation. Additional input: Bike Lanes, nice benefit!	No response required.
Welton	Dan	3376 W. 2200 S.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes I do. Master plan was poorly followed over time creating this problem. I hope they learn a lesson for the future.	Get it done as soon as possible so we can move further west sooner due to all of the growth westward past Bluff to 3000 W or 4000 W.		According to the Wasatch Front Regional Council's Long Range Plan, additional improvements to Syracuse Road between 2000 West and Bluff Street would occur between 2013 and 2022.
Whiteley	Robert	3269 S. 800 E.	Syracuse	UT		1	1			Yes.	Let's get it done.		No response required.
Wilcox	Con L. & Jerilyn	1455 S. 1000 W.	Clearfield	UT	1492 W. 1700 S.	1							

Syracuse Road 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse
Attendance, Comments, and Responses from February 8, 2006 Public Hearing and Public Comment Period

Last Name	First Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Property Address (if different from mailing)	Attendance	Written Comments	Verbal Comments	Email Comments	Written comments received from Public Hearing Comment Forms		Comment received verbally at the hearing or received by email	Response to Comments
										The Draft Environmental Impact Statement identifies Alternative C as the least impacting, most beneficial alternative to meet the purpose and need of the project. Do you agree with this conclusion?	Please list any comments, concerns, and/or suggestions relating to the project.		
Wilcox	Derek & Julie	2717 W 2175 S	Syracuse	UT		2	1				No, I think the Alternative C is not the most beneficial Alternatives like E & F are the best in "least impacting" - no or minimal relocations, limited problems with historic sites, and safer for ourselves and children. These alternatives need to be re-evaluated, more in-depth so others can see their benefits like here: Yes, Alternative C sounds good but why settle. Alternative C does not take into account the public's safety. What about the teenagers walking down the streets, or mom's walking with their kids. Too often children run out into their yard - and sometimes into traffic! - What about the 4 year old who now has a smaller front yard & gets hit by a car going 45 mph? - ormore? What about all the cars backing out of their driveways? or cars turning into the driveways? cars backing out onto 45 mph traffic - an accident waiting to happen! & the risk for head on collisions? - a raised median btwn the roads will eliminate over 27% of accidents. What about more noise walls? - we could put more up if we chose something like Alternative E & F. Thus E & F would minimize the effect on "historical sites" and the subsequent relocations. This way (Alternatives E & F) could have a raised median, noise walls all while providing a way to get from 1000 West to 2000 West. Yes, it would raise taxes & may cost more, but isn't it better to do it right the first time? - protecting our children, increasing safety as well as providing a scenic drive?		Alternatives E and F were looked at extensively as they minimize impacts to Section 4(f) properties (historic properties and parks). Alternative E was removed from further study because it is not consistent with the Syracuse City General Plan and would segment property planned for major commercial development. Segmenting this property would change the type of commercial development and affect Syracuse City's tax base. Alternative F was eliminated for the same reasons as Alternative E and because it would impact Founders Park.
Williams	James & Lynette	1783 S. Allison Way	Syracuse	UT		2							
Williamson	Shawn	279 W. 650 N.	Clearfield	UT		1							
Wilson	Brad & Roberta	2160 W 700 S	Syracuse	UT		2	1			Yes - Rush it & this is 10 years too late - <u>Please!</u>	1. No lights on Antelope between 1000 W and 2000 W. 2. Pedestrian crossover over Antelope for schoolchildren. 3. Left turn signals (4 ways - east & west - north & south) on 1000 & 2000 W - Traffic sensored lights - <u>Yesterday!</u> Please do this now! Before 2007 project. 4. Continue widening to 2500 W. 5. Light on 2500 W. 6. Lower speed limit - 40 mph. 7. Close off Allison - do not push through on north side - use Marilyn Drive. 8. Right turns only on Banbury to Antelope & Marilyn Dr.		1. A future traffic signal is anticipated at Marilyn Drive when the intersection meets UDOT Signal Warrants. UDOT will continue coordination with Syracuse City regarding the location of the signal. A school crossing will be maintained at Allison Way until the signalized intersection is constructed and would then be located at the signal (Marilyn Drive). 2 . A pedestrian overpass has not been identified as a part of the project, however striped crosswalks will be provided at all signalized intersections. 3. Left turn signals are included in Alternative C for the 1000 West and 2000 West intersections and would be installed as part of the roadway construction. 4. There is a considerable drop in traffic volumes at 2000 West. According to the Wasatch Front Regional Council's Long Range Plan, additional improvements to Syracuse Road between 2000 West and Bluff Street would occur between 2013 and 2022. 5. 2500 West is located outside the limits of this project. 6. The proposed posted speed limit is 45 mph which is consistent with an arterial roadway. 7. UDOT plans to maintain access to Allison Way. Syracuse City has jurisdiction over local roads, including Allison Way, and closure of the roadway would be a Syracuse City decision. 8. Restrictions on left turns to or from Banbury and Marilyn Drive are not anticipated at this time.
Winward	Josh	1860 W 1700 S	Syracuse	UT		1							
Anonymous						1	1			Alternative C looks good to me.	We need this road done now, of a morning it is very difficult to get onto 1700 from any sideroad.		No response required.

128 42 2 6

**Agency Comments & Responses on Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Syracuse Road; 1000 West to 2000 West, Syracuse**

Agency	Comments	Responses
<p>Willie R. Taylor, Director Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance United States Department of the Interior Washington, DC 20240</p>	<p>Page 4-41, Section 4.10.2 Alternative C and Alternative D, first paragraph, second sentence</p> <p>The calculation that runoff will triple because the impervious area will triple is overly simplified. Many variables make this situation more complex, for example: infiltration in pervious areas depends on soil type, roughness, vegetation cover, whether the soil is saturated and/or frozen, the rate of rainfall (a brief downpour as from a summer thunderstorm will have different runoff characteristics than the same amount of rain spread over several hours as in a gentle drizzle), and other variables. In addition, some parts of the roadway or other impervious areas, which may presently drain to pervious areas where runoff can infiltrate, will drain to storm sewers in the proposed action. For these reasons, it would be better not to quantify the predicted amount of runoff in the proposed action without hydrologic modeling or other more detailed analysis.</p> <hr/> <p>SECTION 6(f) COMMENTS</p> <p>The Section 4(f) Evaluation states that there are no Section 6(f) resources in the project area; however, we have reviewed this project in relation to any possible conflicts with the Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) and the Urban Park and Recreation Recover programs, and have found one LWCF project that may be impacted. This is 49-00342, Rock Creek Park located at 4500 West.</p> <p>We recommend that you consult directly with the official who administers the L&WCF program in the State of Utah to determine any potential conflicts with Section 6(f)(3) of the L&WCF Act (Public Law 88-578, as amended). This section states:</p> <p>"No property acquired or developed with assistance under this section shall, without the approval of the Secretary [of the Interior], be converted to other than public outdoor recreation uses. The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if he finds it to be in accord with the ten existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and only upon such conditions as he deems necessary to assure the substitution of other recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location."</p> <p>The administrator for the L&WCF program in Utah is Mr. Seth McArthur, Grants Coordinator, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, 1594 West North Temple, Suite 116, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116. Mr. McArthur's phone number is 801-538-7354.</p>	<p>While many variables affect hydrologic/hydraulic calculations and detailed calculations will not be performed until final design, the project team feels that including approximate runoff values helps the reader and decision makers better understand the magnitude of change and the potential for impacts. Approximations of increased flow anticipated from the increased impervious (roadway) area have been recalculated using the rational method. The chapter text has been modified as follows: "Alternatives C and D would increase the impervious area from about 4 to 12 acres. Using the rational method to predict peak runoff (according to the formula: $Q=CiA$, where C is a runoff coefficient, i is the rainfall intensity, and A is the subcatchment area), the increase in paved area would raise the 10-year peak flow for the project area from roughly 9 cfs to 19 cfs."</p> <p>A letter from Lyle Bennett the Grants Coordinator for the Utah Division of Parks & Recreation dated July 12, 2004 (contained in Chapter 8 of the DEIS), stated that there are no Section 6(f) properties adjacent to Syracuse Road between 1000 West and 2000 West. Since that time some LWCF money has been set aside for Rock Creek Park (verified by Horrocks Engineers with Seth McArthur - new Grants Coordinator on March 21, 2006) located from 700 South to 800 South and 2000 West to 3950 West in Syracuse, which is outside of the study area for this project and would not be impacted by the project.</p>

Willie R. Taylor, Director
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
United States Department of the Interior
Washington, DC 20240

SECTION 4(f) COMMENTS

No response required.

The Section 4(f) Evaluation is a comprehensive analysis of all types of Section 4(f) properties that contains thoughtful dialogue and useful graphics. The Department recognizes and appreciates the coordination conducted with Federal, State, and local agencies, and the general public. We acknowledge that you have consulted with the Utah State Historic Preservation Office, and will be preparing a Memorandum of Agreement in conjunction with interested and affected parties to minimize adverse effects to historic properties. Furthermore, we appreciate that you have considered future planned projects such as the bicycle paths already contained in local plans.

Following our review of the Section 4(f) Evaluation, we concur that there is no feasible or prudent alternative to the Preferred Alternative selected in the document, and that all measures have been taken to minimize harm to these resources. We appreciate the opportunity to review this document.

Larry Svoboda, Director NEPA Program
Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation
United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 8
Denver, CO 80202-2466

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 8 (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) regarding proposed improvements to the Syracuse Road corridor between 1000 West and 2000 West in Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah. Our comments are provided in accordance with our responsibilities and authorities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

No response required.

The DEIS analyzes one mile of improvements, with three alternatives, including the no-action alternative. Although the Executive Summary indicates that the preferred alternative will not be identified until after the Public Hearing, Alternative C is described as the "least impacting, most beneficial alternative" (ES-14).

Overall, the DEIS is well organized and thorough in the information it provides. EPA's policy is to rate the preferred alternative, which in this case is Alternative C. EPA rates the preferred alternative an EC-1 (environmental concerns, adequate information). EPA has environmental concerns because the project involves the relocation of homes and businesses due to right-of-way acquisitions. There are 81 total properties impacted by a taking under either of the two action alternatives. Construction of Alternative C could result in the relocation of 23 residences, one residence/business and one business along Syracuse Road. The 1 rating reflects the adequacy of the document's qualitative analysis of how those impacts would be minimized and mitigated under the preferred alternative.

No response required.

On page 4-18, the document states that "an approved quantitative method for PM10 hot spot analysis has not been developed." Please note that EPA expects to announce a final conformity rule for PM2.5 and PM10 soon, and updated information on the final rule can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/traq/conform/general.htm>.

Although the final conformity rule was announced on March 10, 2006, the Syracuse Road project is within an attainment zone for PM and thus no additional analysis is required.

Thank you for considering these comments, which are provided to assist FHWA and UDOT in designing a highway improvement project that protects resources while meeting the purpose and need for action. EPA's review and participation in this project will be coordinated by Jody Ostendorf (303-312-7814) of my staff. Please feel free to contact her regarding these comments or future EPA involvement in this project.

No response required.